

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification; objected to the drawings; and rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The aforementioned rejection and objections are traversed and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner objected to the specification because “starting on page 4, line 25 through to page 7, line 17 and page 11 line 4 to page 12 line 29... the text and alpha/numeric expressions as cited in the specification fail to correlate with Figs. A, B, A, B, A and B to which the text and alpha/numeric expressions refer.” As an example, the Examiner cites page 5, line 9 “in the expression ‘ $P(J \cdot I - 1), M$ ’ the letter P is not defined and an interpretation of the expression is not made clear.” Additionally, the Examiner states “the expressions set forth in the text of said pages 4 to 7 and 11 to 12 are not shown in Figs a, b, a, b, a or b.”

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to the Applicants’ specification, for example, at least at beginning at page 4, lines 2-5 “Each pixel on the liquid crystal panel can be expressed by an equivalent circuit as shown in Fig. 4. In Fig. 4, the pixel includes a TFT connected between a gate line GL and a data line DL...” to page 4, lines 25-30, “Referring to Fig. 5A and Fig. 5B, there are shown a liquid crystal panel 10 having liquid crystal cells arranged in a matrix... N column driver IC’s 12 for individually applying a video signal to M data lines DL, and J gate driver IC’s 14 for individually driving K gate lines GL. Herein, J, K, M and N are an integer...” and to page 5, lines 8-9 “Voltages charged in the odd-numbered pixels $P(J \cdot (2I - 1), M)$, $P(J \cdot (2I - 1), 2M)$, ...” and to page 5, lines 13-17 “and the pixels $P(J \cdot K, M + 1)$, $P(J \cdot K, 2 \cdot M + 1)$, ... connected to the right data line DL at boundary portions of the adjacent column driver IC’s 12 in odd-numbered frames as shown in Fig.

5A..." where it is shown that the text and alpha/numeric expressions cited therein do correlate with the Figures to which the text and alpha/numeric expressions refer.

While the Examiner states the letter "P" is not defined and an interpretation of the expression is not made clear, Applicant respectfully submits that the expression, for example "P(J*K, M+1)" is the notation for the pixel at the (J*K)th gate line (row) and (M+1)th data line (column) of a panel (matrix) P. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art will implicitly understand the meaning and relevance of the abovementioned expressions as well as other similar expressions contained within the specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the expressions set forth in the text of pages 4 to 7 and 11 to 12 are implicitly shown in the Figures.

The objection to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner states "the feature as taught in claims 1 and 5 wherein 'each pixel block includes at least two data lines within the liquid crystal panel to apply data signals having the same polarity to the adjacent pixels in a gate line direction within the pixel block' must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)." Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner, for example, to page 8, lines 18-19 of the specification stating "at least one pixel block... includes at least two data lines within the liquid crystal panel" and to page 10, line 21 - page 16, line 1 describing Figures 7A, 7B, 8A, and 8B. For example, in describing Figures 7A and 7B, the specification states "...the N column driver IC's 22 apply video signals with the same polarity to the data lines DL included in the boundary portions in such a manner that the video signal with the same polarity is applied to the adjacent pixel cells in

the gate line direction” at page 10, line 30 - page 11, line 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the drawings because they are believed to be in full compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

The rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 as being indefinite because “...claims 1 and 5... fail to teach... what specifically constitutes ‘a block’. Said claims read ... ‘at least one pixel block’... it is unclear whether the claims mean ‘a pixel’ constitutes a block or ‘multiple pixels’ constitute a block.” The Examiner also states “none of the drawings show a block, or a block wherein adjacent pixels with the same polarity are set between pixels on the right and left of said adjacent pixels that are of a contrary polarity.”

In answer to the question “what constitutes ‘a block’ ”, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1 and 5 state “...at least one pixel block each of which includes at least two data lines within the liquid crystal panel.” Additionally, as explained above, the drawings show a pixel block wherein adjacent pixels with the same polarity are set between pixels on the right and left of said adjacent pixels that are of a contrary polarity. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1-10 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants believe the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner deem that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500.

Application No.: 09/654,943
Group Art Unit: 2673

Docket No.: 8733.294.00
Page 5

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office,
then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please credit any overpayment to
deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Respectfully submitted,

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE, LLP

Date: September 27, 2002

By *Kurt M. Eaton*

Kurt M. Eaton
Registration No: P-51,640

Teresa M. Arroyo
Registration No: 50,015

1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone No.: (202) 496-7500
Facsimile No.: (202) 496-7756



30827

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE